Reply of Government.—The existing law is sufficient and the Chief Court has issued a circular explaining its scope. If the subordinate Courts do not act in accordance with the provisions of the law, let the matter be taken up to the Chief Court.

SUBJECT No. 21.

Extending the provisions of the Breach of Contract Act to "Jitagars."

Messrs. Lakshminarasimhachar, Chamrajnagar, and S. Sitaramaiya, Shimoga Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—The provisions of the Breach of Contract Act at present extend only to labourers working in coffee estates. Its provisions may, it is prayed, be amended so as to bring the agricultural labourers (known in this country as "Jitagars") also under its purview.

Reply of Government.—The Act applies generally to all artificers, workmen and labourers who have received advances and refuse to work. If any Court refuses to enforce its provisions in cases other than those between coffee planters and their coolies, let the matter be taken up to the Chief Court.

The *scope* of the Act cannot however be extended.

SUBJECT No. 22.

Amendment of Section 248 of the Civil Procedure Code.

Mr. Tirumal Rao.

Summary of discussion.—The provisions of Section 248 of the Civil Procedure Code, requiring a notice to be issued to a party against whom execution of a decree is applied for, give much scope for him to dispose of or remove his property with intent to obstruct the execution or to evade his arrest. It is therefore proposed that the notice may be made to issue along with the warrant of attachment or arrest, subject to the provisions contained in the Code for attachment before judgment.

Other members spoke against the proposal.

Reply of Government.—Not possible.

SUBJECT No. 23.

Amendment of the Land Revenue Code.

Messrs. Inamdar Madappa, Mysore Taluk; Raghavachar and Padmanna, Nanjangud Taluk; B. Kesavaiengar and Kesavadasaiengar, Belur.

Summary of discussion.—According to the Land Revenue Code (Section 54), the land revenue on Government occupied land is a paramount charge on the holding. But many judges doubt the applicability of that rule to inam lands. As the Chief Court has decided that the rent due to an Inamdar on an inam land is not a paramount charge on the holding, it is requested that the section of the Code may be so amended as to make it applicable to inam lands also in respect of arrears of kandayam due to an Inamdar up to twelve years.

Inamdars were hitherto under the impression that rent due to them was a charge on the land and that consequently the period of limitation was twelve years. But the recent decision of the Chief Court is that it is not a charge on the land. So unless they take steps against the tenant under Section 97 of the Land Revenue Code during the year for which the rent is due, they can enforce only the personal liability of the tenant and are likely to lose the rent. In